（一）以下是摘錄自 BBC 中文網有關穆罕默德漫畫風波的幾則新聞。請根據各自學術背景以及理論思考，對此事件進行分析，並展開有關社會理論與文化理論的討論。討論時，請扣緊你要發揮的理論議題，針對你所援用之理論進行評估，說明此理論之背景脈絡，並透過理論思考對此次漫畫事件展開較為深入的討論。
（占本科總分 50%）

2005 年 12 月 29 日
丹麥報紙發表穆罕默德漫畫引發抗議

動畫作品的發表在哥本哈根引發了抗議示威

阿拉伯聯盟外交部長對丹麥政府未對發表先知穆罕默德漫畫的一家丹麥報紙採取行動而提出了譴責。外交部長們在埃及開羅舉行的阿拉伯聯盟會議上說，他們對丹麥政府對此的回應感到“吃驚和不滿”。伊斯蘭教義禁止描繪先知穆罕默德或安拉。丹麥出版的《於爾蘭郵報》發表了描繪先知穆罕默德的十二幅漫畫。其中一幅漫畫顯示穆罕默德將一顆炸彈放在他的穆斯林纏頭巾上。阿盟部長理事會說，這些漫畫是對伊斯蘭的侮辱。這個聲明說，儘管丹麥與穆斯林世界有著政治、經濟和文化方面的聯繫，但丹麥政府的回應“令人失望”。

死亡威脅

丹麥穆斯林社區領袖曾在七月份與丹麥首相安諾斯．福格．拉斯穆森舉行會談，向他投訴丹麥媒體對伊斯蘭報道的方式。當時，拉斯穆森首相表示，他無法告訴報社報道什麼或者不報道什麼。阿盟外長還表示，歐洲人權組織沒有對此表示其清晰立場，他們對此感到不滿。在有關先知穆罕默德的漫畫發表之後，丹麥和穆斯林國家都曾爆發過示威抗議活動。丹麥報紙堅稱它有言論自由，並表示報社將一如既往發表報紙認為應該發表的文字或圖片。《於爾蘭郵報》說，該報紙和漫畫作家都收到了死亡威脅。
全世界爆發穆斯林抗議襲潰漫畫浪潮

伊拉克、巴勒斯坦、埃及等地的穆斯林周五（2月3日）紛紛走上街頭，抗議丹麥等歐洲國家刊登有關穆罕默德的漫畫。這些漫畫共有12幅，是關於穆罕默德的。這些漫畫最早發表於丹麥出版的《貝爾蘭郵報》。其中有一幅漫畫顯示穆罕默德的頭巾狀像一個炸彈。在印尼首都雅加達，伊斯蘭教守衛者陣線的人員一度闖入了丹麥駐印尼大使館所在的大樓，以抗議"漫畫對先知穆罕默德的侮辱"。不過，在保安的阻止下，抗議者未能進入位於該樓25層的丹麥大使館。而是在使館外向丹麥的標誌投擲雞蛋和西紅柿。大約一小時後，丹麥駐印尼大使館在當地媒體上刊登道歉聲明，抗議者才逐漸散去。

其它國家抗議情況

在伊拉克，什葉派穆斯林最高領袖西斯塔尼對歐洲國家出版這樣的漫畫進行了譴責。但他同時表示，伊斯蘭教的極端武裝分子也要為破壞了伊斯蘭世界的形象負責。在巴勒斯坦，據悉一些西方國家記者和援助組織工作人員因為擔心遭到攻擊而開始撤離。在巴基斯坦城市拉合爾和木爾坦，有數百名學生上街抗議。該國上議院以全票贊成通過一項聲明，譴責漫畫的出版。在約旦和法國，出版了漫畫的報紙已經將相關編輯撤職。伊斯蘭教教義禁止描述先知穆罕默德或安拉，但西方媒體監督機構則表示，報社擁有發表這些漫畫的自由。這些漫畫在丹麥出版後，法國、德國、意大利、匈牙利、荷蘭和西班牙等國的報刊紛紛進行了轉載。這些國家的報紙認為，他們有這樣的言論自由。

2006年2月20日
布希呼籲遏制抗議宗教漫畫暴力示威

美國總統布希向世界各國政府發出呼籲，要求他們阻止針對報紙發表伊斯蘭先知穆罕默德漫畫出現的暴力示威。布希在白宮會見到訪的約旦國王阿卜杜拉時發出上述呼籲的，這也是他首次就穆罕默德漫畫事件公開發表談話。布希說："我們反對以暴力方式對由媒體刊登的內容表達不滿，我要求各國政府制止暴
力，表現出尊重，保護財產，保護無辜的外交官的生命。”布希在為新聞自由辯護的同時還表示，新聞自由也伴隨著責任。有關穆罕默德漫畫的紛紛在歐洲大陸和中東地區引起軒然大波，但是在美國卻顯得相對比較平靜。美國國務卿賴斯週三（2月8日）指責伊朗和敘利亞在漫畫抗議事件上蓄意煽風點火。賴斯說，伊朗和敘利亞利用這個機會煽動反西方情緒和暴力。

暴力不斷

阿富汗已經多次發生漫畫抗議

阿富汗警方說，侮辱伊斯蘭先知穆罕默德的漫畫，在該國引發的進一步示威，造成了4人死亡、20人受傷。在阿富汗首都喀布爾，示威者向數個歐洲國家大使館投擲石塊。在阿富汗西北部，數百抗議者襲擊一個挪威維和部隊的基地。員警向示威者開槍，結果造成一人死亡。阿富汗總統卡爾紫伊說，他對漫畫事件感到遺憾。他說，阿富汗人已經意識到駐紮在阿富汗的歐洲部隊與他所稱的褻瀆神聖的漫畫事件沒有任何關係。阿富汗官員說，反政府分子和犯罪分子可能是在利用這場爭執達到自己的目的。阿富汗最高宗教機構呼籲結束騷亂，並將因漫畫事件而採取暴力是沒有道理的。
RICHARD WAGNER: THE JEWISH DANGER

In 1850 Richard Wagner published an (anonymous) article, “Judaism in Music.” It first gave to extreme anti-Semitism the support of an artist of genius.

If emancipation from the yoke of Judaism appears to us the greatest of necessities, we must above all prove our forces for this war of liberation. Now we shall never win these forces from an abstract definition of the phenomenon per se, but only from an accurate acquaintance with the nature of our involuntary feeling of an instinctive repugnance against the Jew’s essential character. Through it, through this unconquerable feeling—if we avow it quite without ado—must there become plain to us what we hate in that essence; what we then know clearly, we can oppose; nay, through his very laying bare, may we even hope to rout the demon from the field, wherein he has only been able to maintain his stand beneath the shelter of a twilight darkness—a darkness we good-natured humanitarians ourselves have cast upon him, to make his look less loathsome.

The Jew—who, as everyone knows, has a God all to himself—in ordinary life strikes us primarily by his outward appearance, which, no matter to what European nationality we belong, has something disagreeably foreign to that nationality: instinctively we wish to have nothing in common with a man who looks like that. By far more weighty, nay, of quite decisive weight for our inquiry, is the effect the Jew produces on us through his speech; and this is the essential point about the Jewish influence upon music. The Jew speaks the language of the nation in whose midst he dwells from generation to generation, but he speaks it always as an alien. . . . Our whole European art and civilization, however, have remained to the Jew as a foreign tongue; for, just as he has taken no part in the evolution of the one, so has he taken none in that of the other; but at most the homeless wight has been a cold, nay more, a hostile on-looker. In this speech, this art, the Jew can only after-speak and after-patch—not truly make a poem of his words, an artwork of his doings. . . .

Alien and apathetic stands the educated Jew in the midst of a society he does not understand, with whose tastes and aspirations he does not sympathise, whose history and evolution have always been indifferent to him . . .

Now, our modern arts had likewise become a portion of this culture, and among them more particularly that art
which is just the very easiest to learn—the art of music, and indeed that music which, severed from her sister arts, had been lifted by the force and stress of grandest geniuses to a stage in her universal faculty of expression where either, in new conjunction with the other arts, she might speak aloud the most sublime, or, in persistent separation from them, she could also speak at will the deepest bathos of the trivial. Naturally, what the cultured Jew had to speak, in his situation, could be nothing but the trivial and indifferent, because his whole artistic bent was in sooth a mere luxurious, and needless thing. At present no art affords such plentiful possibility of talking in it without saying any real thing, as that of music, since the greatest geniuses have already said whatever there was to say in it as an absolute separate-art. After this there was nothing left but to babble after; and indeed with quite distressing accuracy and deceptive likeness, just as parrots reel off human words and phrases, but also with just as little real feeling and expression as these foolish birds. Only in the case of our Jewish music-makers this mimicked speech presents one marked peculiarity—that of the Jewish style of talk in general, which we have more minutely characterised above. . . .